

THE MISSING PAGE OF NICOLAAS VAN WIJK'S
EDITION OF THE OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC
ΑΝΔΡΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΟΣ*

Jos Schaecken

1. In October 1988 the Slavists of the Netherlands celebrated the 75th anniversary of the founding of the chair for Balto-Slavic languages at the University of Leiden, the oldest chair for Slavic studies in the country. On this occasion a collection of essays on the life and work of Nicolaas van Wijk, the first professor to fill the Leiden chair from 1913 until his untimely death on 25 March 1941, was published (Groen *et al.* 1988). My contribution to this *Gedenkschrift* (Schaecken 1988a) deals with the sad vicissitudes and the reconstruction of Van Wijk's second part of his *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache (Zweiter Band: Syntax, Wortschatz und Wortbildung)*. After its completion in 1927 it remained unpublished until Van Wijk's death and, subsequently, disappeared without any trace probably somewhere in Germany during the Second World War.¹

When Van Wijk died, he also left behind another major manuscript which he had completed in the late 1930s and which had not yet been published. It contained a critical edition of the Old Church Slavonic translation of the Ἀνδρῶν ἁγίων βίβλος, known as the *Skete Patericon (Skitskij paterik)*, with a sixty-page introduction (*Einleitung*) in German. For the basis of his edition Van Wijk used the abridged redaction of the *Skete Patericon* as found in the so-called *Mihanović-Patericon* (National Library, Vienna, MS Slav. 152 olim 137; Bulgarian, 14th c.), supplying the missing passages from three other manuscripts: National Library, Paris, MS Slav. 10 (Serbian, 14th c.); University Library, Leiden, MS BPL 2290 (Serbian, late 13th/early 14th c. — see below); MS Monastery Krka in Dalmatia (No. 34 in Van

* This research was supported by the Netherlands organization for scientific research, N.W.O. I am grateful to Professor C.H. van Schooneveld and Mr. P. de Ridder for providing me with some interesting details on the vicissitudes of Van Wijk's manuscript (edited by Armstrong *et al.* 1975).

¹ As far as I know, there is also one article of Van Wijk to be rediscovered: "Die Vokale *i* und *y* in den ostslavischen und den anderen slavischen Sprachen." It was originally meant to be his contribution to the Ivan Zilyns'kyj *Festschrift*, which was being prepared in 1939 but did not appear because of the outbreak of the Second World War (cf. Schaecken 1988b: 149).

Wijk's own list — cf. Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 42, 92–; Bulgarian, 1345–46). In the *Einleitung* Van Wijk explains that he has not been able to take the full redaction of the *Skete Patericon* into consideration, because the only manuscripts in which the full redaction is presented are Russian and because Russian manuscripts happened to be almost inaccessible at the time Van Wijk was writing. Moreover, “der so wichtige Methodianische Text” should be published without delay (cf. Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 45).

2. Van Wijk's edition of the Old Church Slavonic Ἀνδρῶν ἁγίων βίβλος was intended to appear as a separate issue of the Munich journal *Südost-Forschungen*, edited by Fritz Valjavec.² However, the outbreak of the Second World War prevented publication and the manuscript was accordingly sent back to Leiden. When it arrived in 1941, Van Wijk was no longer alive. In the same year Kuiper wrote in his obituary: “Das Manuskript liegt druckfertig vor und wird hoffentlich nach Beendigung des Krieges bald erscheinen können” (1941: 393). His hopes proved to be in vain.

It took no less than thirty years after the end of the War until Van Wijk's manuscript finally appeared in 1975 as volume 1 of Mouton's series *Slavistic Printings and Reprintings*, edited by D. Armstrong, R. Pope and C.H. van Schooneveld.³ In his foreword to the edition (1975: V–VIII) Van Schooneveld relates the unfavourable circumstances which in large part caused publication to be delayed for such a long time. The difficult task of the typesetting of the book as well as financial problems must for the first editor (Van Schooneveld) have played a crucial role in the delay until the end of the 1950s. When both obstacles had been more or less removed, H.G. Lunt acquired possession of the manuscript in the summer of 1959 and undertook to edit it. For some reason, however, Lunt did not feel it possible to deliver the manuscript for typesetting within a reasonable period. After more than twelve years, Van Schooneveld resumed his task as editor (together with Armstrong and Pope) of Van Wijk's manuscript.

² A few letters from Valjavec to Van Wijk are kept in the Leiden Van Wijk archives. In a letter of 17 March 1941 (one week before Van Wijk's death) we find an interesting passage about the difficulties with the typesetting of the book: “Meinen herzlichsten Dank für Ihr freundliches Schreiben. Ich würde gerne versuchen, die Schrift in einer anderen Druckerei drucken zu lassen, bin aber leider durch kontraktliche Verpflichtungen an die Druckerei Rohrer gebunden; die Schwierigkeiten, die sich aus einer Änderung dieser Abmachungen ergeben würden, möchte ich lieber vermeiden. Immerhin könnten Sie es vielleicht versuchen, sich mit der (Leiden, —JS) Druckerei Brill in Verbindung zu setzen.”

³ The book is reviewed by Lunt (1976), Bláhová (1977), Thomson (1977) and Birkfellner (1980a).

3. Let us return to the year 1941. Van Schooneveld informs us in his foreword (1975: V): “Professor Valjavec decided to send the manuscript of the Methodius Patericon back to Holland, where, *with the exception of page 3 of the Introduction, which was evidently lost in transit*, it arrived after Van Wijk's death” (my italics). At the spot where page 3 of the *Einleitung* is missing in the edition (1975: 31), Pope writes: “We know from note 2 on p. 68 of this “Einleitung” that the page (. . .) dealt at least in part with the so-called *Roman Patericon*. Apparently the *Sinaitic Patericon*, or at least Leonid's views on it, was also mentioned. See below, p. 36, note 14” (1975: 31, n. a). A few months ago I found two almost identical copies of the missing page 3 in the Leiden Van Wijk archives. I have here used the version which was apparently meant to appear in print for reproduction in facsimile and for the subjoined transliteration. On the back of this copy Van Wijk wrote down the *apparatus criticus* of folio 6r of the *Mihanović-Patericon*. The same *apparatus* as well as the full text of folio 6r can also be found on a separate piece of paper which belongs evidently to the other copy of page 3. Since the missing folio 6r in Van Wijk's manuscript has already been supplied by the editors (cf. 1975: 103–104), I shall not reproduce its contents here.

The fact that Van Wijk made two copies of page 3, which are slightly different from each other (one being obviously an earlier version of the other), offers a clue for answering the question how this part could have been separated from the rest of the manuscript. Since Van Wijk was apparently used to making the necessary corrections and additions in his manuscripts only just before the very beginning of the typesetting,⁴ I conjecture that at the time of the author's death page 3 of the *Einleitung* was still (or again) in Leiden for correction, whereas the rest of the text was in the care of the editor in Munich. Subsequently, after 1941 the manuscript arrived in the safe of the Board of Trustees of the University of Leiden, while the two copies of page 3 disappeared out of sight in the Leiden Van Wijk archives.

Following I shall give the text of page 3 of the *Einleitung*, which is to be inserted on page 31 of the edition. Then I intend to discuss its contents.

⁴ When in 1928 De Gruyter Publishing House was too occupied to take on the typesetting of the second part of the *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache*, the manuscript was sent back to the author. Van Wijk, however, immediately returned it to the publishers: “Ich möchte Sie bitten, mir den guten Empfang zu bestätigen und es mir etwa einen Monat vor der Drucklegung nach vorheriger Mitteilung für die Addenda zuzuschicken” (draft of a letter of 21 April 1928, kept in the Leiden Van Wijk archives).

(Um so leichter habe ich davon abgesehen, als der Wortschatz des Nomokanons, der ein juristischer Text ist, notwendigerweise bedeutend von demjenigen des Paterikon abweicht.

Der Frage, welches Paterikon in der Legende gemeint ist, hat man weniger Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet als dieselbe verdient hätte. Es handelt sich ja doch um einen der ältesten kirchenslavischen Texte! Sobolevskij hat einige male die Ansicht ausgesprochen, dass das von Method übersetzte Paterikon die griechische Übersetzung der *Dialogi de vita et miraculis patrum italicorum et de aeternitate animarum* Gregors des Grossen gewesen sei (Διάλογοι ιστορικοί περί πολιτείας διαφόρων πατέρων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ διαλαμψάντων), welcher Text auch unter den Namen *Römischen Paterikon* bekannt ist, obgleich er nicht, wie die andern Paterika, eine Sammlung von Aussprüchen und Anekdoten frommer Mönche ist. In einer frühern Arbeit habe ich denjenigen Teil des Wortmaterials des "Römischen Paterikon", der uns aus dem von Sobolevskij herausgegebenen Wörterverzeichnis bekannt ist, einer Untersuchung unterzogen², wobei sich ergab, dass zwar ein Teil der Wörter ein altertümliches Gepräge hat und von Method gebraucht sein könnte (*apostoliki* 'Pabst', *godina* 'ῥρα', *eterb*, *životb* 'ζωή', *zaklerb*, *iskrb*, *-bñb*, *klepati* 'σημαίνειν', *korenitb*, *laeti* 'ἐνεδρεύειν', *perpriezn*, *perbštivati*, *obavnikb*, *oblastb* 'ἐξουσία', *ogavie tvoriti*, *ocštjenje*, *pivo* 'ποτόν', *plaštanica*, *radi*, *săměfenomodrystvo*, *uzbъmb*, *šnica*, *jedro*, *jedropisъb*, *jezykъ* 'ἔθνος'), dass aber ein anderer Teil des Vokabulars, worunter einige Wörter protobulgarischen Ursprunges, die Entstehung dieser Übersetzung in der mährischen Periode des Altkirchenslavischen ausschliessen (*batogb*, *brěgačii* 'κόμης'), *bělbčii*, *vinnica* 'ἀποθήκη', *goněti*, *gospoda* 'ἄπλικτον', *drezga*, *kapi*, *košara*, *kričb*, *kъbčii*, *ogněna matica*, *onъsica*, *sokalsъkъ*, *svražie*, *tinb* 'λωρίς', *lъpъrъs*, *tečьno*, *čigotb*, *črēmiga*). Vermutlich ist die Übersetzung nach Methods Tode und der Flucht seiner Schüler aus Mähren, irgendwo in Bulgarien von einem Menschen, der die Kyriilo-Methodianischen lexikalischen Traditionen noch kannte, gemacht worden; auf Method kann dieselbe aber nicht zurückgehen.

Andere irgendwie wissenschaftlich begründete Meinungen über den Grundtext von Methods Paterikon sind, soviel ich weiss, bis 1931 nicht ausgesprochen worden³. Wohl hat ein russischer Forscher, und zwar N.K. Nikol'skij, die Hypothese aufgestellt, dass. . .

¹ S. A. Sobolevskij, *Римскіи Патерикъ въ древнемъ церковнославянскомъ переводѣ* (in dem *Изборникъ Киевскіи*, Kiev 1904) = izd. "Istoričeskoe Obščestvo Nestora-letopisca", *posvjašč. T.D. Florinskomu*, —JS; *Материалы и изслѣдованія* III (= *Materialy i izslėdovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii* (Sbornik ORIAS IAN 88/3), S.-Peterburg 1910, —JS).

² Studien 27-31 (= *Studien zu den altkirchenslavischen Paterika* (= *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, afd. letterkunde N.R.* 30/2), Amsterdam 1931, —JS).

³ Leonid hat in seinem kurzgefassten *Свѣдѣніе о славянскихъ и русскихъ переводахъ Патериковъ различныхъ наименованіи и обзоръ редакцій оныхъ* [Чтенія въ Имп. Общ. Исторіи и Древностей русскіихъ при Моск. Университетѣ 1890 г. IV [155], Moskau 1890] die Ansicht ausgesprochen, dass Method den *Синаѣскіи Патерикъ* übersetzt habe; diese Ansicht beruht wohl nur darauf, dass diese Übersetzung aus einer ziemlich alten Handschrift bekannt ist.

des Nomokanons, der ein juristischer Text ist, notwendigerweise bedeutend von demjenigen des Paterikon abweicht.

Die Frage, welches Paterikon in der Legende gemeint ist, hat man weniger Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet als dieselbe verdient hätte. Es handelt sich ja doch um einen der ältesten kirchenslavischen Texte! Sobolevskij hat einige male die Ansicht ausgesprochen, dass das von Method übersetzte Paterikon die griechische Übersetzung der *Dialogi de vita et miraculis patrum italicorum et de aeternitate animarum* Gregors des Grossen gewesen sei (Διάλογοι ιστορικοί περί πολιτείας διαφόρων πατέρων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ διαλαμψάντων), welcher Text auch unter den Namen *Römischen Paterikon* bekannt ist, obgleich er nicht, wie die andern Paterika, eine Sammlung von Aussprüchen und Anekdoten frommer Mönche ist. In einer frühern Arbeit habe ich denjenigen Teil des Wortmaterials des "Römischen Paterikon", der uns aus dem von Sobolevskij herausgegebenen Wörterverzeichnis bekannt ist, einer Untersuchung unterzogen², wobei sich ergab, dass zwar ein Teil der Wörter ein altertümliches Gepräge hat und von Method gebraucht sein könnte (*apostoliki* 'Pabst', *godina* 'ῥρα', *eterb*, *životb* 'ζωή', *zaklerb*, *iskrb*, *-bñb*, *klepati* 'σημαίνειν', *korenitb*, *laeti* 'ἐνεδρεύειν', *perpriezn*, *perbštivati*, *obavnikb*, *oblastb* 'ἐξουσία', *ogavie tvoriti*, *ocštjenja*, *pivo* 'ποτόν', *plaštanica*, *radi*, *săměfenomodrystvo*, *uzbъmb*, *šnica*, *jedro*, *jedropisъb*, *jezykъ* 'ἔθνος'), dass aber ein anderer Teil des Vokabulars, worunter einige Wörter protobulgarischen Ursprunges, die Entstehung dieser Übersetzung in der mährischen Periode des Altkirchenslavischen ausschliessen (*batogb*, *brěgačii* 'κόμης'), *bělbčii*, *vinnica* 'ἀποθήκη', *goněti*, *gospoda* 'ἄπλικτον', *drezga*, *kapi*, *košara*, *kričb*, *kъbčii*, *ogněna matica*, *onъsica*, *sokalsъkъ*, *svražie*, *tinb* 'λωρίς', *lъpъrъs*, *tečьno*, *čigotb*, *črēmiga*). Vermutlich ist die Übersetzung nach Methods Tode und der Flucht seiner Schüler aus Mähren, irgendwo in Bulgarien von einem Menschen, der die Kyriilo-Methodianischen lexikalischen Traditionen noch kannte, gemacht worden; auf Method kann dieselbe aber nicht zurückgehen.

Andere irgendwie wissenschaftlich begründete Meinungen über den Grundtext von Methods Paterikon sind, soviel ich weiss, bis 1931 nicht ausgesprochen worden³. Wohl hat ein russischer

¹ S. A. Sobolevskij, *Римскіи Патерикъ въ древнемъ церковнославянскомъ переводѣ* (in dem *Изборникъ Киевскіи*, Kiev 1904) = *Материалы и изслѣдованія* III (= *Materialy i izslėdovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii* (Sbornik ORIAS IAN 88/3), S.-Peterburg 1910, —JS).

² Studien 27-31.

³ Leonid hat in seinem kurzgefassten *Свѣдѣніе о славянскихъ и русскихъ переводахъ Патериковъ различныхъ наименованіи и обзоръ редакцій оныхъ* [Чтенія въ Имп. Общ. Исторіи и Древностей русскіихъ при Моск. Университетѣ 1890 г. IV [155], Moskau 1890] die Ansicht ausgesprochen, dass Method den *Синаѣскіи Патерикъ* übersetzt habe; diese Ansicht beruht wohl nur darauf, dass diese Übersetzung aus einer ziemlich alten Handschrift bekannt ist.

4. Page 3 is part of the first chapter of the *Einleitung*: "Das Problem von Methods Paterikon-Übersetzung" (1975: 29–32). Here Van Wijk discusses chapter XV of the *Vita Methodii*, which deals with the literary activities of Methodius after the death of his brother: *prěloži vь bьrže vьsę knigy isprьnь. razvě makavěi. oть grьčьska jazyka vь slověnskь . . . tьgda že i nomokanonь rekъše zakonu pravilo. i oтьčьskьja knigy prěloži*. Especially the question of what is to be understood by the ambiguous phrase *oтьčьskьja knigy* interested Van Wijk.

In the winter of 1930–31 the antiquarian bookseller E. von Scherling showed Van Wijk two folia of a Serbian Church Slavonic text (now Leiden, MS BPL 2290). A few months later Van Wijk (1931) published the two folia, which he had identified as a part of a Slavic translation of the Ἁνδρόων ἁγίων βίβλος (*Skete Patericon*). In the same article he tried for the first time to determine what text the phrase *oтьčьskьja knigy* refers to and concluded that it is in all likelihood a direct translation of πατερικόν (*scil.* βιβλίον). About the much debated question which type of patericon Methodius translated Van Wijk was in doubt. In his contribution to the Second Congress of Slavists in Warsaw 1934 he finally decided on the *Skete Patericon*: "Nie ulega wątpliwości, że mamy tu do czynienia z tekstem z okresu panońsko-morawskiego. Otóż, ponieważ "Legenda Panońska" wspomina o tłumaczeniu jakiegoś "Pateryka" przez Św. Metodego, przypuszczam, że tym "Paterykiem" jest właśnie nasz tekst" (1934: 168, cf. also 1937). In numerous articles he adduced linguistic arguments (archaisms, especially Pannonomoravianisms, both in grammar and in lexicon) as well as extralinguistic arguments in support of the Methodian origin of the *Skete Patericon*.⁵

5. I shall now discuss the first paragraph, the last paragraph and footnote 3 of page 3 in relation to the rest of chapter I of the *Einleitung*.

Before entering upon the actual issue of his book, Van Wijk (cf. Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 30–31) takes a stand on the identification of Methodius' *nomokanonь* (*rekъše zakonu pravilo*) as mentioned in *VM XV*. Lexical characteristics lead him to believe that Methodius obviously translated the collection of John Scholasticus entitled *Synagoge in Fifty Titles*, and not the

⁵ For extensive bibliography on Van Wijk's writings on Slavic paterica, see Armstrong *et al.* (1975: 25–26). To article No. 19 (Van Wijk 1937–38) can be added a review by Tschizewskij (1941). For an excellent survey of various schools of thought concerning the meaning of *oтьčьskьja knigy*, I refer to Pope in his preface to Van Wijk's edition (Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 1–24). See also Pope (1974), Veder (1973) and Birkfellner (1979: 25–44).

Syntagma in Fourteen Titles.⁶ Van Wijk was fully aware of the fact that an examination of the lexical relationships between Methodius' nomocanon, Methodius' patericon, and the oldest biblical texts would be of great value to enlarge our knowledge of the Pannonomoravian type of language. However, "Wenn ich nicht fürchtete, dadurch das Erscheinen meiner Paterik-Ausgabe bedeutend zu verzögern, hätte ich jene Arbeit selber gemacht und die Resultate in dieses Buch aufgenommen. Um so leichter habe ich davon abgesehen, als der Wortschatz. . ." (cf. Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 31). The first paragraph of page 3 follows immediately after this quotation.

In the last paragraph of page 3 Van Wijk turns to Nikol'skij's view (1928) the *отьцьскыя книги* in *VM XV* refers to interpretative biblical commentaries rather than some kind of patericon. Van Wijk (cf. Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 31–32) opposes this theory by arguing that (1) a short and illustrative text such as a patericon would be the most appropriate edifying literature for enlightening a wide audience, and (2) biblical commentaries reflect in general the lexical type of language in Simeon's time (for more details see also idem 1931: 21–24). Pope (in Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 4–8) has already pointed out that some of Van Wijk's arguments for attacking Nikol'skij's theory can scarcely hold up against a more critical approach of the matter.

In footnote 3 of page 3 Van Wijk refers to a "rather" old manuscript of the *Sinaitic Patericon* (i.e., the Slavic translation of the *Δειμών πνευματικός* of John Moschos), which is in fact the twelfth-century MS 551, Synodal Collection, State Historical Museum in Moscow. Elsewhere in his edition (cf. Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 36, 75–76) Van Wijk attempts to refute the idea of a Methodian provenance of the *Sinaitic Patericon* (cf. also idem 1931: 30–33). He stresses the absence of Pannonomoravianisms and draws up a list of grammatical and lexical elements which can hardly be attributed to the Methodian type of language, their archaic character notwithstanding.⁷

6. The main text of page 3 of the *Einleitung* deals with the rejection of Sobolevskij's theory that Methodius translated the *Roman Patericon*. Here and elsewhere (1931: 27–30, 1933–34: 336, 1938: 6), Van Wijk argues that

⁶ Van Wijk's findings concerning the translation of the nomocanon have been elaborated upon by Vašica (1955, 1959, 1963a, 1963b: 12–21, 1966: 63–70). From the preserved table of contents of the second part of the *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache* (cf. Schaecken 1988a: 135–138) we know that Van Wijk has written a paragraph on the lexical characteristics of the nomocanon: "Nomokanon Methods" (§ 125). See also § 126: "Das Syntagma in XIV Titeln." As to the patericon question, see § 142: "Paterik von Sinai."

⁷ The theory that Methodius translated the *Sinaitic Patericon* has been supported by Ivanova (1965). Its text is now available in the edition of Golyšenko and Dubrovina (1967), with a glossary by Dumitrescu (1973–76).

the lexical elements represented in the *Roman Patericon* show clearly that the text cannot have been translated from Greek before the late ninth or tenth century, in all likelihood somewhere on Bulgarian territory.

Rather recently Mareš (1972, 1974, 1986) has defended Sobolevskij's idea about the supremacy of the *Roman Patericon*. If we confine ourselves to Mareš' counterattack against Van Wijk's objections based on the lexicon,⁸ the former argues that the oldest version of the *Roman Patericon*, on the one hand, evidently reveals a lexical layer of Pannonomoravian origin. On the other hand, Mareš (cf. especially 1972: 211–212, 1974: 26–28) tries to point out that the lexical elements Van Wijk (cf. page 3 of the *Einleitung* and 1931: 29) considered to be of relatively recent East Bulgarian origin, are very old and not specifically Bulgarian at all, as far as they are attested in the oldest version ("version A"), and as far as they cannot be shown to be the work of later scribes. However, it should be noted that Mareš mainly concentrates on Van Wijk's list of supposed younger Bulgarisms, which in its turn is an abstract of Sobolevskij's (non-exhaustive) word-list of the *Roman Patericon*. It is regrettable that in this respect only part of the vocabulary has been taken into account, especially since a negative proof (i.e., the absence of lexical Bulgarisms) for the Methodian provenance of the *Roman* (as well as the *Sinaitic* or *Skete*) *Patericon* is more substantial than a positive proof (i.e., the presence of lexical Pannonomoravianisms), as Pope has already pointed out: "it would surprise me if any late ninth or very early tenth-century Bulgarian texts, translated before the norms of the Preslav School had really solidified (. . .), did *not* preserve some lexical Pannonomoravianisms and did *not* resemble the oldest Methodian texts" (in Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 24).

Finally, it should be stressed that, as far as I know, Mareš never in any detail has accounted for his rejection of Van Wijk's (and others') adherence to the *Skete Patericon* theory. Hence, as long as Mareš does not support his refutation by adducing convincing arguments, I cannot accept his conclusion that the *Roman Patericon* is the best candidate to claim the title "Methodius' Patericon": "die *отьцьскыѣ кнѣигы* "die patristischen Bücher, *libri Patrum*", von deren Übersetzung ins Slavische Vita Methodii berichtet, waren mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit Gregorii Magni *Dialogorum libri quatuor*" (Mareš 1972: 216–217). Even if we accept Mareš' theory, there is in

⁸ For relevant comments on Mareš' arguments supporting his theory that Methodius translated the *Roman Patericon*, see Pope (in Armstrong *et al.* 1975: 19–20), Birkfellner (1974, 1979: 34–44, 1980b) and Bláhová (1977: 230). Thanks to Mareš, who picked up the thread at the point where Sobolevskij had dropped it, we now have a rather clear picture of the textual tradition of the *Roman Patericon* (cf. also Birkfellner 1979, Reinhart 1985).

my opinion still another, equally suited candidate: the *Skete Patericon*, which has been proven by Van Wijk to be definitely of an archaic Methodian type of language.

University of Leiden

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, D., R. Pope and C.H. van Schooneveld (eds.)
1975 *The Old Church Slavonic Translation of the ΑΝΑΡΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΒΙΒΛΙΟΣ in the Edition of Nikolaas van Wijk* (= *Slavistic Printings and Reprintings* 1), The Hague-Paris.
- Birkfellner, G.
1974 "Gregorius I. der Grosse und die slavischen »Paterika« (Anmerkungen zu einer Theorie)," *Slovo* 24, 125-133.
1979 *Das Römische Paterikon. Studien zur serbischen, bulgarischen und russischen Überlieferung der Dialoge Gregors des Großen mit einer Textedition* I, Wien.
1980a (Review of Armstrong et al. 1975) *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 26, 223-225.
1980b "Einmal mehr zur Frage der "otčeskyje knigy" (Vita Methodii XV) (Literatur- und wirkungsgeschichtliche Erwägungen)," *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 26, 112-133.
- Bláhová, E.
1977 (Review of Armstrong et al. 1975) *Byzantinoslavica* 38, 229-234.
- Dumitrescu, M.
1973-76 *Sinajskij paterik. Ukazatel' slov i form I (A-M) (1973), II (N-Ω) (1976)*, București.
- Golyšenko, V.S. and V.F. Dubrovina
1967 *Sinajskij paterik*, Moskva.
- Groen, B.M., J.P. Hinrichs and W.R. Vermeer (eds.)
1988 *Nicolaas van Wijk (1880-1941). A Collection of Essays on his Life and Work Published on the Occasion of the 75th Anniversary of the Founding of the Chair for Balto-Slavic Languages at Leiden University* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 12), Amsterdam.
- Ivanova, T.A.
1965 "Zametki o leksike Sinajskogo Paterika (K voprosu o perevode Paterika Mefodiem)," *Problemy sovremennoj filologii. Sbornik statej k semidesjatiletiju akademika V.V. Vinogradova*, Moskva, 149-152.
- Kuiper, F.B.J.
1941 "Nikolaas van Wijk," *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* 25, 390-395.
- Lunt, H. G.
1976 (Review of Armstrong et al. 1975) *Slavic Review* 35, 581-582.
- Mareš, F.V.
1972 "Welches griechische Paterikon wurde im IX. Jahrhundert ins Slavische übersetzt?," *Anzeiger der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klasse* 109/19, 205-221.
1974 "S. Gregorii Magni *Dialogorum Libri IV* — Die »Bücher der Väter« der *Vita Methodii*," *Slovo* 24, 17-39.
1986 "De S. Gregorii Magni *Dialogorum* versione palaeoslovenica," *Colloques internationaux du CNRS, GRÉGOIRE LE GRAND*, Paris, 569-574.
- Nikol'skij, N.K.
1928 "K voprosu o sočinenijax, pripisyvaemyx Kirillu Filozofu," *Izvestija po russkomu jazyku i slovesnosti* 1, 399-457.

- Pope, R.
1974 "N. van Wijk's Edition of the 'Ανδρῶν ἁγίων βίβλος,'" *Slovo* 24, 135-137.
- Reinhart, J.
1985 "Ein vernachlässigter Textzeuge des kirchenslavischen 'Römischen Paterikons'," *Litterae slavicae medii aevi Francisco Venceslao Mareš Sexagenario Oblatae* (= *Sagners Slavistische Sammlung* 8), ed. J. Reinhart, München, 275-297.
- Schaecken, J.
1988a "Die Geschichte einer Geschichte. Zu dem II. Band der *Geschichte der altkirchenslavischen Sprache: Syntax, Wortschatz und Wortbildung* von Nicolaas van Wijk," *Nicolaas van Wijk (1880-1941)*, ed. B.M. Groen, J.P. Hinrichs and W.R. Vermeer, Amsterdam, 129-146.
1988b "Bibliographia Nicolai van Wijk: Addenda et Corrigenda," *Nicolaas van Wijk (1880-1941)*, ed. B.M. Groen, J.P. Hinrichs and W.R. Vermeer, Amsterdam, 147-149.
- Thomson, F.J.
1977 (Review of Armstrong et al. 1975), *The Slavonic and East European Review* 55, 392-393.
- Tschizewskij, D.
1941 (Review of Van Wijk 1937-38), *Südost-Forschungen* 6, 661-662.
- Vašica, J.
1955 "Metodějův překlad nomokanonu," *Slavia* 24, 9-41.
1959 "Collectio 87 (93) capitulorum dans les nomocanons slaves," *Byzantinoslavica* 20, 1-8.
1963a "Právní odkaz cyrilometodějský," *Slavia* 32, 331-339.
1963b "Kirillo-Mefodievskie juridičeskie pamjatniki," *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 7, 12-33.
1966 *Literární památky epochy velkomoravské 863-885*, Praha.
- Veder, W.R.
1973 "Was ist Methods Väterbuch?," *Dutch Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists*, ed. A. van Holk, The Hague-Paris, 153-162.
- Wijk, N. van
1931 *Studien zu den altkirchenslavischen Paterika* (= *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, afd. letterkunde* N.R. 30/2), Amsterdam.
1933-34 "Die Erzählungen des Sketioten Daniel im Kirchenslavischen," *Slavia* 12, 335-352.
1934 "O Pateryku, przetłumaczonym przez św. Metodego," *II Międzynarodowy zjazd slawistów (filologów słowiańskich). Księga referatów. Sekcja I — językoznawstwo*, Warszawa, 167-169.
1937 "O Pateryku, przetłumaczonym przez Metodego," *Prace Filologiczne* 17, 59-65.
1937-38 "Die älteste kirchenslavische Übersetzung der Homilie: εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελισμόν τῆς Ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου," *Byzantinoslavica* 7, 108-123.
1938 "Der großmährische Erzbischof Method als Übersetzer von Erbauungsliteratur," *Slavische Rundschau* 10/6, 6-9.